PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF APRIL 24, 2006

2006-0276 – Application for a Special Development Permit on a 3,384 square foot site to allow a 176 square foot one story addition to a 1,881 square foot home resulting in 60.7% Floor Area Ratio where 45% may be allowed without Planning Commission review. The property is located at **533 Anacapa Terrace** (near Morse Ave) in an R-2/PD (Low-Medium Density Residential/Planned Development) Zoning District. (APN: 204-16-088) KD **(Continued from April 10, 2006)**

Kelly Diekmann, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. Mr. Diekmann said the corrected name of the applicant/contractor is All Seasons Remodeling (ASR). He said staff is recommending approval with conditions, and noted that Condition of Approval (COA) 1.C requires the applicant "...provide evidence of approval from the affected homeowners association (HOA) that the sunroom meets CCR architectural review standards of the association" prior to the issuance of a building permit for the addition.

Chair Hungerford asked about the permanency of structure. Mr. Diekmann said that he believes the structure is permanent and that the applicant would address this question in his presentation. Chair Hungerford asked which of the fence or the proposed structure were taller. Staff said the fence is a typical six-foot good neighbor fence and the sunroom will be taller and visible to adjoining properties. Chair Hungerford confirmed with staff that all of the neighboring properties are two-story.

Comm. Klein referred to Attachment C, page 3 and asked how high the top of the first floor window sill is on the backside of the house. Staff said that the top of the first floor sill is approximately seven feet. Comm. Klein asked if staff considered adding a COA requiring additional landscaping for the site to reduce visibility of the structure from neighboring properties. Staff said no.

Chair Hungerford opened the public hearing.

David Johnson, applicant with ASR, clarified that typically the thickness of the concrete pad is about four inches and the height of the sunroom is about nine feet. He clarified that the addition is considered permanent, that the structure is attached to the concrete pad and the house and has a lifetime warranty. Mr. Johnson said he spoke with the contact at the HOA this evening, as he just recently found out there was an HOA, and made arrangements to send him three sets of drawings, an introductory letter and that he will be following up with the contact on the approval process.

Comm. Klein asked if the structure would require any electrical connections. Mr. Johnson said yes that the structure would require a 20 amp circuit, but there would be no heating, or air conditioning as the structure is strictly for recreational purposes.

Comm. Simons asked if there would be a step down from the residence into the sunroom. Mr. Johnson said that there would be a ¾ inch step down from the existing residence and, based on building code regulations, a maximum 1 inch step down from the sunroom outside.

Comm. Klein asked Mr. Johnson about COA 1.D, "The exterior walls of the sunroom addition shall be treated to match the existing home." He asked what the typical exterior finish for the structure would be to make the sunroom's exterior walls fit into the neighborhood. Mr. Johnson said there is a pre-fab exterior finish on the sunroom and presented pictures of materials showing samples of the exterior of the sunroom. He explained that ASR tries to match the exterior color of the home.

Comm. Simons asked if the material is a vinyl-like exterior. Mr. Johnson said the material is "TEMKOR" which is a textured type of polymer surface, with the color throughout the material. Mr. Johnson said the texture may not match exactly to the stucco exterior of the residence. Comm. Simons asked staff what the intent of COA 1.D was. Mr. Diekmann said "treat" means to staff, color and texture, but not the same material so if the applicant can provide a texture to the finish and a color that matches the home, that would meet the condition.

Chair Hungerford confirmed with Mr. Johnson that the structure has a solid roof rather than a glass roof.

Mr. Diekmann said, based on some of the discussion tonight, that staff recommends a COA be added that the sunroom height should not exceed 10 feet rather than what was stated in the staff report. Mr. Diekmann said, based on looking at the sample pictures of the materials provided by the applicant, that the roof type should be defined. Mr. Diekmann confirmed with Mr. Johnson that a height limit of 10 feet would be acceptable, and asked if the exterior of the sunroom would be approximately the texture and color of home. Mr. Johnson said he would have to look into how much the texture can be varied. Mr. Johnson said the color of the sunroom framing would match the trim of the home.

Comm. Simons asked staff to modify the wording of COA 1.D about the exterior walls of the sunroom. **Trudi Ryan**, Planning Officer, suggested that the wording of COA 1.D be changed to "...color and texture that complements the existing architecture of the home."

Comm. Klein asked Mr. Johnson what roof composition is proposed. Mr. Johnson said the roof is normally made of aluminum sandwiched pane, about

four inches thick with a high-density foam-insulated 4-foot wide panel and textured panel. The proposed roof would be a white textured roof. Mr. Johnson said if the Commission alters the roof that he will need to check with the customer. Comm. Klein and staff discussed the roof composition, style and pitch. Staff said the proposed metal roof is acceptable if the metal is painted.

Chair Hungerford commented if the metal roof was shiny that it may be distracting to the neighbors. Mr. Johnson explained that a person looking down from a second-story window would see a textured white finish. He said with other ASR sunroom installations there have not been issues with neighbors with second-stories regarding reflection from the roof. Chair Hungerford asked if the roof could be painted a different color. Mr. Johnson said he would have to research whether the roof could be painted as there is a special finish baked on the panels and it could affect the lifetime warranty.

Chair Hungerford closed the public hearing.

Chair Hungerford discussed with Comm. Simons possible glare from the roof as Comm. Simons said he has seen similar sunrooms. Comm. Simons commented that the similar sunrooms he has seen probably could not have been painted and the roofs were a glossy white or whatever color was initially chosen.

Comm. Babcock said she thinks the homeowner would be most affected by any glare from the roof, rather than neighbors.

Comm. Klein moved for Alternative 2 to approve the Special Development Permit with modified conditions: to modify COA 1.D adding the wording "with a color and texture similar to the existing home" as staff recommended; to add COA 1.F "The height of the sunroom shall not exceed 10 feet"; to add COA 1.G "The applicant is to work with staff on the appropriate roof color to fit in with the surrounding community." Comm. Sulser seconded.

Comm. Klein said he was able to make the findings. He said there were some questions about the color, but with staff working with the applicant and homeowner that the building will fit in with the community. He noted that staff included COA 1.E to make sure the homeowner does not convert the sunroom and into living space.

Final Action:

Comm. Klein made a motion on 2006-0276 to approve the Special Development Permit with the modified conditions: to modify Condition of Approval (COA) 1.D adding the wording "with a color and texture similar to the existing home"; to add COA 1.F "The height of the sunroom shall not exceed 10 feet"; to add COA 1.G "The applicant is to work with staff on the appropriate roof color to fit in with the surrounding community." Comm. Sulser seconded.

Motion carried unanimously, 5-0, Vice Chair Fussell absent.

This item is appealable to City Council no later than May 9, 2006.